REMARKS

Claims 44 - 62 are pending in the application, are rejected, and are at issue.

Applicants traverse the rejection of claims 44, 45, 48, 49, 53, 54, 57-59 and 62 as anticipated by Meeker U.S. Patent No. 5,742,034.

Independent claim 44 specifies a safe comprising a housing, a door movably mounted to the housing and an electronic lock including a lock control circuit for selectively opening or locking the door. A programmable control unit is operatively associated with the electronic lock for monitoring activities performed with the safe. The control unit comprises a communication interface for communication on an external network. The control unit automatically transmits information associated with the monitored activities to a user via the external network responsive to select changes in status of the monitored activities.

An anticipation can be established only by a single prior art reference disclosing each and every element of the claim, arranged as in the claim. Meeker does not anticipate claim 44.

Meeker does not disclose or suggest a safe including a control unit comprising a communication interface for communication on an external network. Nor does it disclose or suggest a control unit automatically transmitting information associated with monitored activities to a user via an external network.

Meeker is directed to a safe including a PC board connected to an input/output communication port or jack 154. The port 154 is used so that the system can generate a report sent through the port or jack 154. An RS 232 or RS 485 port comprises a serial port used for

communications between a computer and a peripheral device. Indeed, Meeker describes at col. 4, lines 14-21, that the port can be used to interface with an accounting system or computer. There is no disclosure or suggestion that the safe be hooked up to an external network. Moreover, Meeker only discloses that a user can print reports or generate reports that are sent to the port. There is no disclosure or suggestion of the safe automatically transmitting information associated with monitored activities to a user via an external network responsive to select changes in status of monitored activities. Instead, the safes are described more in the nature of a peripheral device to a computer. There is no disclosure or suggestion that the control unit include an interface or provides communication on an external network.

Because Meeker does not disclose each and every element of claim 44, arranged as in the claim, the anticipation rejection is improper.

Claims 45, 48 and 49 depend from claim 44 and are not anticipated for the same reasons therefor.

Independent claim 53 specifies an apparatus for monitoring a safe comprising an electronic lock for controlling a safe and through which a plurality of different types of transactions can be performed. A programmable control unit is coupled to the electronic lock for controlling the electronic lock and recording security information related to the different types of transactions. The control unit comprises a communication interface for communication on an external network. The control unit automatically transmits recorded security information to a user via the external network responsive to performance of select ones of the transactions.

Claim 53 is not anticipated for the same reasons discussed above relative to claim 54. Likewise, dependent claims 54, 57-59 and 62 are not anticipated.

For the above reasons, claims 44, 45, 48, 49, 53, 54, 57-59 and 62 are believed allowable and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Applicants traverse the rejection of claims 46 and 55 as obvious over Meeker in view of Wagner U.S. Patent No. 3,878,511.

Claims 46 and 55 depend from claims 44 and 53, discussed above, and further specify a duress sensor and the control unit transmits indication of a duress condition determined by the duress sensor.

Wagner does not disclose or suggest the deficiencies noted above with respect to Meeker. While Wagner discloses a duress sensor, the duress sensing operates an electrical contact which can be connected to provide remote indication. There is no disclosure or suggestion regarding connection to an external network. Therefore, the combination does not result in the claimed invention and ought be withdrawn.

Applicants traverse the rejection of claims 51 and 60 as obvious over Meeker.

Claims 51 and 60 depend from claims 44 and 53, respectively and further specify that the communication interface comprises a modem. The system in Meeker contemplates a direct connection via a serial interface to a printer or computer. There is no disclosure or suggestion that the connections could be anything other than a direct connection. A modem requires a telephone line interconnection. This is not a direct connection. Use of such a modem requires

additional security precautions in the context of a safe operation. Absent some specific suggestion that such a communication system would be desirable, applicants submit that the proposed modification is not obvious so that claims 51 and 60 are allowable.

Applicants traverse the rejection of claims 47 and 56 as obvious over Meeker in view of Bentley U.S. Patent No. 6,529,723.

Claims 47 and 56 depend from claims 44 and 53, respectively, and further specify that the control unit transmits recorded security information to a user via the external network with an e-mail notification.

Bentley does not disclose or suggest the deficiencies noted with respect to Meeker. Moreover, the combination is improper. Bentley is directed to a network operation system having nothing to do with a safe. It is not analogous with Meeker. The references are not properly combined.

The action states that Meeker does not disclose any notification format. Indeed, Meeker does not disclose any type of notification. It merely discloses that the system can generate specified reports or provide determined status information. There is no disclosure or suggestion that the safe itself automatically provides notification of any monitored event. The ability to generate a requested report is distinct from the control unit itself generating a notification. Claims 47 and 56 are believed allowable for these reasons as well.

Applicants traverse the rejection of claims 52 and 61 as obvious over Meeker in view of Nishijima U.S. Patent No. 5,915,069.

Claims 52 and 61 depend from claims 44 and 53, respectively, and further specify a video capture device for monitoring an external area proximate a safe wherein the monitored activities comprise video information recorded by the control unit.

Nishijima does not disclose or suggest the deficiencies noted with respect to Meeker. Moreover, the system of Nishijima is a stand alone system. There is no disclosure or suggestion that it be integrated with a safe wherein a safe control unit records video information from a video capture device. Therefore, the combination is improper and the combination does not result in the claimed invention.

For the above reasons, claims 52 and 61 are believed allowable.

Summarizing, the principal reference, Meeker, relates to a safe connected as a peripheral device to a computer. There is no disclosure nor suggestion that the safe be connected to an external network to transmit recorded security information to a user via the external network.

Reconsideration of the application and allowance and passage to issue are requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 28, 2007

F. William McLaughlin
Reg. No. 32,278

WOOD, PHILLIPS, KATZ,
CLARK & MORTIMER
Citigroup Center, Suite 3800
500 West Madison Street
Chicago, Illinois 60661
Telephone: (312) 876-1800